

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOx 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		1999-0804	6102	
09/665,780	09/20/2000	Herman Chien	1999-0804	0102	
20	01/27/2004	EXAMIN		INER	
30003 7570			NGUYEN, DUC MINH		
PERKINS COIE LLP/AWS					
P.O. BOX 1247			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, WA	A 98111-1247	<u>.</u>	2643	16	
			DATE MAILED: 01/27/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/665,780	CHIEN, HERMAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Duc Nguyen	2643				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timey within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) daywill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
··· _	A.F.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	kaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. 						
Attachment(s)						
1)	5) Notice of Informal P	(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-12, 14-16, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hartmaier (6,553,022).

Consider claim 1. Hartmaier teaches a network (fig. 1-2) that utilizes a modem (modem pool 210) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (authentication platform 218; col. 4, ln. 57 to col. 5, ln. 36, fig. 3); a search module (processor 230) for searching a database (234; col. 5, ln. 21-36); a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Consider claims 2-4. Fig. 1-3, col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10 read on the limitations of claims 2-4.

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 6. Hartmaier teaches a network (fig. 1-2) that utilizes a modem (modem pool 210) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (authentication platform 218; col. 4, ln. 57 to col. 5, ln. 36, fig. 3); a search module (processor 230) for searching a database (234; col. 5, ln. 21-36); a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Consider claims 7-8. Fig. 1-3, col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10 read on the limitations of claims 7-8.

Consider claims 10-12. Hartmaier teaches a network (fig. 1-2) that utilizes a modem (modem pool 210) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (authentication platform 218; col. 4, ln. 57 to col. 5, ln. 36, fig. 3); a search module (processor 230) for searching a database (234; col. 5, ln. 21-36); a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Consider claim 14. Hartmaier further teaches the user places a telephone call via a modem pool (modem pool 210 or 260; fig. 2).

Consider claims 15-16. Hartmaier teaches a network (fig. 1-2) that utilizes a modem (modem pool 210) for processing calls made through the network, comprising a server (authentication platform 218; col. 4, ln. 57 to col. 5, ln. 36, fig. 3); a search module (processor 230) for searching a database (234; col. 5, ln. 21-36); a billing aggregator module, a correlating module and a billing module (col. 4, ln. 54 to col. 6, ln. 10; especially col. 5, ln. 50 to col. 6, ln. 10).

Consider claim 18. The method as taught by Hartmaier is inherently performed for each of multiple users of the network who would like to access an ISP via a modem pool.

Art Unit: 2643

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 5, 9, 13, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartmaier (6,553,022) in view of Ronen (5,745,556).

Consider claims 5, 9, 13, 17. Hartmaier does not teach the network comprises a wireless network.

Ronen teaches the network comprises a wireless network (col. 10, ln. 6-29).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teachings of Hartmaier in view of Ronen in wireless environment in order to obtain or gain more profits by expanding the system nationwide.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 11/13/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the Hartmaier reference, applicant states that Hartmaier does not disclose "controlling access to which users can place outgoing phone calls and to authenticating a user as an authorized network user before such outgoing phone calls can be made, and in particular does

Art Unit: 2643

not perform such authentication before allowing a telephone call for the user to be placed via a modem." In contrast to applicant's assertions, before the caller (202) in figure 2 of Hartmaier can be connected to either ISP (236 or 228), he/she has to pass the authentication process performed by the authentication platform (218, see steps 302-318 of fig. 3). If the user passed the authentication process, then the call can be made via modem (pool) (210, see steps 318-328 of fig. 3). Otherwise, the call cannot go through the modem (pool) (210, see steps 318, 330 and 328 of fig. 3). It is noted that telephone call is not limited to voice call. On pages 5-7 of applicant's specification clearly disclose that telephone call is Internet, Intranet, WAN, or LAN access. The modem preferred in the claim is the modem located at the modem pool, not the modem located at the user computer [Emphasis added]. In order for the network receiving a request from the user, the user has to initiate a call to the network using the computer modem. However, after the authentication process, the call is placed through a modem at the modem pool.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2643

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-308-7527. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00AM-2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 703-305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-6000.

Duc Nguyen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2643

1/16/04